TABLE 6
Alternative Summary Descriptions

Alternative	Description
1—No Further Action	• No mitigations are constructed • Uses the existing AMD collection, conveyance, storage, treatment, and sludge management systems • CTP is not upgraded or repaired. The CTP is shut down in 3 to 5 years when the existing sludge disposal capacity is exhausted.
2—Treatment Only	• No mitigations are constructed • Uses existing AMD collection, conveyance, and storage systems • Pipeline added for direct flow capability to CTP • CTP upgraded to 5,000 gpm capacity with filters for high-density sludge (HDS) operation, attainment of TMDLs, and compliance with discharge standards. • Alternative 2A uses new CIA sludge disposal beds. Alternative 2B uses mechanical sludge dewatering and offsite disposal. Alternative 2C uses sludge disposal beds located above the smelter closure area. Alternative 2D uses CIA sludge drying beds and annual excavation and disposal in a landfill located above the smelter closure area. Alternatives 2A, 2C, and 2D are estimated to produce about 5,400 y^3/yr of sludge. Alternative 2B is estimated to produce about 10,300 y^3/yr of sludge because the mechanical dewatering is expected to be less efficient than sludge drying beds or sludge disposal beds.
3—Phased Mitigations/Treatment	• Uses a phased implementation and performance evaluation approach for mitigations and CTP sizing. Following initial actions, up to 10 years of monitoring and performance evaluation is used to determine if more mitigations or treatment capacity is needed. • Initially implements the West Fork Milo Creek Diversion, rehabilitates the Phil Sheridan Diversion, and plugs in-mine drill holes, which collectively are expected to reduce peak mine water flows. Total annual volumes are expected to be reduced by about 10 percent by initial mitigations. • Uses existing AMD collection and conveyance with pipeline added for direct flow capability to CTP. • Uses existing lined pond and new gravity diversion system into in-mine storage. Also includes new mine pool extraction pumps. • The initial CTP hydraulic and neutralization capacity is 5,000 gpm. The initial filtration capacity is 2,500 gpm. Lime consumption is expected to be reduced 10 percent by initial mitigations. • Uses one of the four sludge disposal options described for Alternative 2. The sludge volume is expected to be initially 10 percent less than Alternative 2 because of the mitigation-induced AMD volume reduction.
4—Phased Mitigations/Treatment with Plugging of Near-Stream Workings	• Similar to Alternative 3, except plugs are initially placed in the Small Hopes drift below Mainstem Milo Creek, and in the Inez Shaft below Deadwood Creek. These will reduce or eliminate the potential for stream erosion into the underlying mine workings. These two mitigations would be implemented under Alternative 3 if needed, based on the monitoring program and the phased approach.
5—Treatment with All Mitigations	• Similar to Alternatives 3 and 4, except a phased approach is not used. All mitigations are implemented initially, and the CTP is sized at 2,500 gpm with no potential phased expansion. Mitigation performance monitoring is conducted for 5 years, then stopped.

BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS